Sl.No.	States	Rs. Crores
1	2	3
14.	Uttar Pradesh	46.84
15.	West Bengal	68.77
	Total : B	784.22
	Grand Total (A+B)	1378.68

STATEMENT-II

Increase in Normal Assistance* Include U.T's own resources. To Union Territories in 1991—92 over 1990—91

Sl.No	Union Territories	Rs. Crores
1	2	3
1.	Andaman and Nicobar Islands.	57.50
2.	Chandigarh	9.39
3.	Dadra, Nagar Haveli	8.51
4.	Daman & Diu	3.60
5.	Delhi	120.00
6.	Lakshdweep	0.96
7.	Pondicherry	15.00
	Total	214.96

*Include U.T's own resources.

Central Investment in Central Projects

6773. SHRI GIRDHARI LAL BHARGAVA: Will the Minister of PLANNING AND PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION be pleased to state:

(a) the percentage of Central investment in various Central Projects, State-wise as at the end of 1990-91;

(b) whether only two per cent of the total capital invested in the country has been invested in Rajasthan;

(c) if so, the reasons therefor; and

(d) the steps contemplated to increase to Central investment in Rajashtan?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE

MINISTRY OF PLANNING AND PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION (SHRI H.R. BHARDWAJ): (a) Central plan investment is not made on a State-wise basis and thus it is not possinle to give an a accurate breakup. However, a Statement showing the approximate estimates of Statewise break-up of Central plan expenditure and the percentage thereof pertaining to the first three years of the Seventh Five Year Plan - viz., 1985-86 (actuals), 1986-87 (RE) and 1987-88 (BE) is given in the statement. This is based on several assumptions and the figures so complied provide at best only a dimensional appreciation of the situation.

(b) to (d). Central Plan investment is made for the country as a whole, keeping national priorities in view. Further, Central investment in programmes/projects is mostly in areas where the necessary economic factors are in optimum availability. These programme/projects in most cases do not have any correlation with the limits of the State Boundaries (for example: railway lines, highways, etc.). They are seldom meant for a particular State; the fruits of these programmes/projects get spread all over the country.

STATEMENT

Statewise Break-up of Central Plan Expenditure

Seventh Five Year Plan: 1985-86 to 1987-88 (Rs. Crores)

Sl. No.	States/U.Ts.	Actual Expenditure 1985-86	Revised Estimates 1986-87	Budget Estimates 1987-88	Total for the three Years
1.	Andhra Pradesh	2105.90 (13.07)	2156.22 (11.23)	2321.37 (11.44)	6583.49 (11.84)
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	15.97 (0.10)	28.62 (0.15)	54.49 (0.27)	99.08 (0.18)
3.	Assam	713.69 (4.43)	612.80 (3.24)	730.50 (3.60)	2065.99 (3.72)
4.	Bihar	1133.68 (7.04)	1284.45 (7.21)	1393.82 6.87)	3911.95 (7.04)
5.	Gujarat	1109.99 (6.89)	1573.98 (8.20)	1585.63 (7.81)	4269.60 (7.68)
6.	Haryana	253.14 (1.57)	249.46 (1.30)	329.64 (1.62)	832.24 (1.50)

Sl. No.	States/U.Ts.	Actual Expenditure 1985-86	Revised Estimates 1986-87	Budget Estimates 1987-88	Total for the three Years
7.	Himachal Pradesh	200.71 (1.57)	298.54 (1.56)	325.79 (1.61)	825.04 (1.48)
8.	Jammu & Kashmir	197.11 (1.22)	167.02 (0.87)	230.64 (1.14)	594.77 (1.07)
9.	Karnataka	558.13 (3.47)	687.32 (3.58)	809.89 (3.99)	2055.34 (3.70)
10.	Kerala	441.61 (2.74)	529.34 (2.76)	531.66 (2.62)	1502.61 (2.70)
11.	Madhya Pradesh	1976.29 (12.27)	2508.83 13.07)	1895.79 (9.34)	6380.91 (11.48)
12.	Maharashtra	1302.28 (8.09)	1522.80 (7.93)	2020.66 (9.95)	4845.74 (8.72)
13.	Manipur	34.33 (0.21	50.21 (0.26)	69.04 (0.34)	153.58 (0.28)
14.	Meghalaya	24.50 (0.15)	26.49 (0.14)	34.36 (0.17)	85.35 (0.15)

Sl. No.	States/U.Ts.	Actual Expenditure 1985-86	Revised Estimates 1986-87	Budget Estimates 1987-88	Total for the three Years
15.	Mizoram	13.38 (0.08)	22.13 (0.12)	16.45 (0.08)	51.96 (0.09)
16.	Nagaland	27.60 (0.17)	30.08 0.16)	55.46 0.27)	113.14 (0.20)
17.	Orissa	1176.75 (7.31)	951.76 (4.96)	1126.29 (5.55)	3254.80 (5.85)
18.	Punjab	254.87 (1.58)	326.03 (1.70)	473.79 (2.33)	1054.69 (1.90)
19.	Rajasthan	532.23 (3.30)	648.12 (3.38)	773.42 (3.81)	1953.77 (3.51)
20.	Sikkim	7.16 (0.04)	7.62 (0.04)	34.56 (0.17)	49.34 (0.09)
21.	Tamil Nadu	827.80 (5.14)	964.75 (5.03)	1069.64 (5.27)	2862.19 (5.15)
22.	Tripura	56.82 (0.35)	54.75 (0.29)	58.23 (0.29)	169.80 (0.31)

Sl. No.	States/U.Ts.	Actual Expenditure 1985-86	Revised Estimates 1986-87	Budget Estimates 1987-88	Total for the three Years
23.	Uttar Pradesh	1702.30 (10.57)	2568.40 (13.38)	2452.45 (12.08)	6723.15 (12.09)
24.	West Bengal	974.70 (6.05)	1234.13 (6.43)	1288.73 (6.35)	3497.56 (6.29)
	Total States	15640.94	18612.85	19682.30	53936.09
25.	A & N Islands	16.62 (0.10)	63.62 (0.33)	18.63 (0.09)	98.87 (0.18)
26.	Chandigarh	13.50 (0.08)	12.19 (0.06)	11.58 (0.06)	37.27 (0.07)
27.	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	1.79 (0.01)	2.10 (0.01)	1.70 (0.01)	5.59 (0.01)
28.	Delhi	366.14 (2.27)	442.38 (2.30)	528.19 (2.60)	1336.71 (2.40)
29.	Goa, Daman & Diu	56.58 (0.35)	53.10 (0.28)	39.42 (0.19)	149.10 (0.27)

Sl. No.	States/U.Ts.	Actual Expenditure 1985-86	Revised Estimates 1986-87	Budget Estimates 1987-88	Total for the three Years
30.	Lakshadweep	1.69 (0.01)	2.43 (0.01)	9.29 (0.05)	13.41 (0.02)
31.	Pondicherry	7.64 (0.05)	9.74 (0.05)	7.00 (0.03)	24.38 (0.04)
	Total U.Ts.	463.96	585.56	615.81	1665.33
Total Allocable		16104.90	19198.41	20298.11	55601.42
Unallocable Amount		3003.58	4467.82	4977.43	12448.83
Grand Total		19108.48*	23666.23	@ 25275.54	$ 68050.25

Figures in brackets indicate percentage shares to the total allocable amount.

(*) The actual expenditure (1985-86) figures in the case of "Rural Development" were supplied by the Pay and Accounts Office.

(@) The totals include : (1) actual expenditure, 1986-87 for " Communications" and (ii) Revised Estimates, 1986-87 of administrative expenditure to be incurred by the Centre on " Rural Development".

($) The totals include : (i) Revised Estimates, 1987-88 for "Communications" and (ii) Budget Estimates, 1987-88 of administrative expenditure to beincurred by the Centre on "Rural Development".

Note:

As Central Plan investment is not planned or accounted State-wise, some assumptions have been made in attempting such a break-up. While they seem to be the best possible assumptions to based such an exercise as this, their validity is certainly of a limited nature. Some examples are given below:

(1) In the case of Railways, where rolling stock is the significant portion of any year's outlay, the distribution is estimated on the basis of route/ K.M. of the track passing through a particular State.

(2) In the case of Aviation, likewise, where the aircrafts cause the bulk of outlays, the distribution is made on the estimation of number of landings in the territory of the particular State.

(3) Break-up of expenditure in Postal Services is estimated Circle-wise.

As Central investment in projects is mostly in areas where the necessary economic factors are in optimum availability, the objective of regional balance can only have limited relevance in such cases.